## REMARKS:

Claims 1-20 are currently being considered, of which claims 1-4, 6-14, 16, 18, and 19 have been amended, and claim 20 has been newly added. No new matter has been introduced.

The Examiner has objected to FIG. 11 because of various noted informalities. In particular, the Examiner has suggested that the destination of arrows S4-3 and S4-5 is missing from FIG. 11. FIG. 11, as amended, shows the destination of arrows S4-3 and S4-5. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract because of various noted informalities. The Abstract has been amended to remove the noted informalities. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to claims 4, 12, and 14 because of various noted informalities. Claims 4, 12, and 14 have been amended to remove the noted informalities. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 16, 18, and 19 stand rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112, as being indefinite.

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 11, and replaces the original sheet for FIG. 11. In FIG. 11, the destination of arrows S4-3 and S4-5 is shown.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner has suggested that there is a lack of antecedent basis relating to aspects of claims 1-3, 8, 11, 12, 18, and 19, and that there is unclear language in claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 13, and 16. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner regarding "said control programs" in claim 18 (line 5), because more than one control program is featured in parent claim 12. Claims have been amended to improve upon the noted unclear language and to remove the noted lack of antecedent basis, where applicable.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Before turning to the cited art, a brief review of the present invention is in order. The present invention relates to a method for verifying a compatibility in electronic equipment having a plurality of electronic units working in cooperation, including performing a first comparison of a first version data of one electronic unit among said plurality of electronic units with a second support version data of said electronic unit being supported by another electronic unit; performing a second comparison of a second version data of the other electronic unit with a first support version data of the other electronic unit being supported by said electronic unit; and verifying the compatibility among said plurality of electronic units using results of said first and second comparisons.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by US2002/0001100 (**Kawanabe**).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With reference to independent claims 1, 10, and 11, the Examiner relies on the following portions of **Kawanabe**: item 30 and 200 in FIG. 1; and paragraphs [0543] to [0549].

In paragraph [0544], **Kawanabe** states "Function version information of the card device is ... compared with that of the card controller" and states "If compatibility/matching upon function control is found, the card device is enabled."

In paragraph [0545], **Kawanabe** states "if no compatibility/matching is found in step S291, it is checked in step S292 if control program information for the card controller having compatibility/matching such as addition of new functions is present on the card device. If such program information is found, the control program information on the card device is read out".

**Kawanabe** discloses that an image process device checks a card version of an inserted card only.

**Kawanabe** does not describe, teach, or suggest the specific comparisons performed according to the principles of the present application, relating to the first version data, second version data, first support version data, and second support version data.

According to the principle of the present invention, each electronic unit has a version and a support version, and checks the versions of other unit by using both versions.

**Kawanabe** fails to describe, teach, or suggest the following features of claim 1, as amended: "a first electronic unit having a first version data of said first electronic unit itself; and a second electronic unit having a second version data of said second electronic unit itself, and a second support version data of said first electronic unit being supported by said second electronic unit, said first electronic unit having first support version data of said second electronic unit being supported by said first electronic unit, wherein at least one of said first electronic unit and said second electronic unit performs a first comparison of the magnitude of said first version data and said second support version data, performs a second comparison of the magnitude of said second version data and said first support version data and verifies the compatibility between said first and second electronic units according to the results of the first and second comparisons", in combination with the other claimed features.

**Kawanabe** fails to describe, teach, or suggest the following features of claim 10, as amended: "said first electronic unit having compatibility verification data for verifying the

compatibility with said second electronic unit, said compatibility verification data comprising: a support version data of said second electronic unit being supported by said first electronic unit itself, to be compared with a version data of said second electronic unit; and a version data of said first electronic unit itself being supported by said second electronic unit", in combination with the other claimed features.

**Kawanabe** fails to describe, teach, or suggest the following features of claim 11, as amended: "performing a first comparison of a first version data of one electronic unit among said plurality of electronic units with a second support version data of said electronic unit being supported by another electronic unit; performing a second comparison of a second version data of the other electronic unit with a first support version data of the other electronic unit being supported by said electronic unit; and verifying the compatibility among said plurality of electronic units using results of said first and second comparisons", in combination with the other claimed features.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 has been newly added. Applicant has presented this additional claim to alternatively and more completely define Applicant's invention and thereby assist the Examiner by facilitating the speedy and compact prosecution of the present invention.

Although the Office Action mailed October 19, 2004 did not address this claim 20, not

hitherto available to the Examiner, Applicant desires to make a record as to why **Kawanabe** does not describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features set forth in claim 20, and otherwise indicate why claim 20 is patentable.

**Kawanabe** fails to describe, teach, or suggest the following features of claim 20: "performing a first comparison of a magnitude of first data stored in the first electronic unit and a magnitude of second data stored in the second electronic unit; when a result of the first comparison indicates that the magnitude of the second data is smaller than the magnitude of the first data, displaying an error indicating incompatibility; when the result of the first comparison indicates that the magnitude of the second data is larger than the magnitude of the first data, performing a second comparison of a magnitude of third data stored in the first electronic unit and a magnitude of fourth data stored in the second electronic unit; when a result of the second comparison indicates that the magnitude of the third data is smaller than the magnitude of the fourth data, displaying the error indicating incompatibility; and when the result of the second comparison indicates that the magnitude of the third data is larger than the magnitude of the fourth data, starting control programs of the first and second electronic units", in combination with the other claimed features.

The features set forth in claim 20 are supported by the application as originally filed (see, for example: FIGS. 1-3; and page 10, line 20 through to page 16, line 1).

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims currently

being considered are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an Interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

Darren R. Crew
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,806

DRC/llf
Atty. Docket No. **011660**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: Substitute Abstract of Disclosure
Replacement Drawing (Fig. 11)
Petition for Extension of Time

## ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE:

An electronic equipment has a plurality of electronic units working in cooperation and verifies the compatibility between entire electronic units having different version data. A first electronic unit has a first version data of the first electronic unit itself and a first support version data of a second electronic unit being supported by the first electronic unit. A second electronic unit has a second version data of the electronic unit itself, and a second support version data of the first electronic unit being supported by the second electronic unit. Either one of the electronic units verifies the compatibility between the plurality of electronic units by comparing the first version data with the second support version data, and also by comparing the second version data with the first support version data.

* * * *